

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to show every feature of the invention in the claims. The 'memory to store data' must be shown in the drawings. Figure 1 has been amended and the replacement sheet is attached to this office action, with the changes highlighted with a circle. As the subject matter of the replacement sheet, the memory, is mentioned in the specification, this does not constitute new matter.

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application.

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner. An annotated drawing sheet is attached to this office action showing the local memory, and an amendment to the specification has been made to include the reference number for the local memory.

The Examiner objected to the title and suggested INTELLIGENT PCI BRIDGING CONSISTING OF PREFETCHING ALL DATA PRIOR TO SENDING DATA TO REQUESTING DEVICE. However, this title does not seem to be descriptive either, as the invention as claimed is not directed to prefetching *all* of the data, but is directed to prefetching data based upon a data size retrieved from a memory. Applicants have amended the title to read INTELLIGENT PCI BRIDGING CONSISTING OF PREFETCHING DATA BASED UPON DESCRIPTOR DATA.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, specifically there is no mention of an article of machine-readable code as recited in Claims 21-28. These claims have been amended to refer instead to a processor having software that causes the processor to perform functions. This is supported in the specification on page 4, among other places. Therefore, this amendment does not constitute new matter.

The specification was also objected to for various informalities, specifically, page 5, line 17, "32bytes", and page 5, line 22, "scope of the invention". These have been corrected by various amendments to the specification.

Claims 10, 13, 23 and 26 recite the limitation "the transmit size" in Claim 10, Claim 13 (line 1), Claim 23 (lines 4 and 6) and Claim 26 (line 1). These claims have been amended to refer to data size, although it must be noted that the term 'transmit size' is used in the specification. See for example, page 5.

Claims 1 and 23 were objected to for informalities that have been corrected to overcome these informalities.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronson et al. (US Patent No. 6,973,528) in view of Imperiali (US Patent No. 6,463,483).

As discussed in the office action, Bronson does not teach receiving descriptor data from the system memory, parsing the descriptor data from the system memory to determine a data size. The Examiner relies upon Imperiali for the descriptor data. However, the descriptor data in Imperiali is not descriptor data that "includes the location and size of the data to be operated upon." The portions of the text referred to in the office action, col. 4, lines 13-20 and 36-42, refer to address signals. However, the address signals are for the device identification (col. 4, line 20), or for the port size and the transfer size of data. There is no specification as to the location. Further, the combination of reference does not teach storing the descriptor data in a memory in the device, such as the bridge, then searching the memory to locate the data descriptor associated with the read request.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18-20, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2, 10, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronson-Imperiali as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Berry et al. (US Patent No. 6,766,511).

As discussed above, the combination of Bronson and Imperiali does not teach the invention as claimed in the base claims. The addition of Berry to this combination would also not render the invention as claimed in amended claims 1, 18, 16 or 21. Berry does not store descriptor data that includes the location and size of the data to be operated upon. Berry

stores identifiers for processes running in a software debugging environment (the pid) and the modules that are being run by those processes. There is no mention of transmit data, its location and size, as required by the base claims from which these claims depend. It is therefore submitted that claims 2, 10, 13 and 17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronson-Imperiali as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Ong (US Patent No. 5,815,662).

As discussed above, the combination of Bronson and Imperiali does not teach the invention as claimed in claim 8, much further the added limitations of claim 15. Ong does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613